UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
33rd meeting
held on
Friday, 9 November 1990
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 33rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. RANA (Nepal)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of and action on all disarmament agenda items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/45/PV.33
13 November 1990
ENGLISH

90-63202 2786V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 66 AND 155 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the programme of work and timetable the Committee this morning will begin taking action on the draft resolutions under disarmament agenda items that appear in clusters 1, 2 and 3. Those draft resolutions are listed in the informal paper distributed to the Committee on 6 November.

Before proceeding to the stage of taking action on draft resolutions I would like once again to remind members of the Committee of the following procedure that should be observed during this stage of the Committee's work. As far as action on each individual cluster is concerned, delegations will first have the opportunity to introduce draft resolutions under that cluster. Following that, delegations will have the oppportunity to make any statement, other than in explanation of their positions or votes, which they regard as necessary with respect to the draft resolutions in that cluster. Subsequently, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on any or all of the draft resolutions in a particular cluster before a decision is taken would do so. Then, after the Committee has taken a decision on the draft resolutions in a given cluster, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes after the decision is taken would do so. With respect to statements and explanations of vote I would urge delegations to make a consolidated statement on draft resolutions contained in a given cluster.

I have just been informed by the delegations of Bulgaria and Pakistan that, following consultations, they have been able to arrive at a single merged text

READEX FICHE

(The Chairman)

combining draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.19 and A/C.1/45/L.9 in cluster 6. I am sure that we all welcome that decision, which is in keeping with the spirit of accommodation and rationalization. Accordingly, with the agreement of the Committee, I am requesting the Secretariat to issue the merged text under a new symbol, A/C.1/45/L.56. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee, who wishes to make some announcements.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that the following States have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1, Afghanistan; L.22 and L.23, the Islamic Republic of Iran; L.29, Costa Rica and the Islamic Republic of Iran; L.34, Samoa and Turkey; L.36, Samoa and Turkey; L.37 and L.44, Turkey; L.49, the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic; L.50, the Islamic Republic of Iran; L.51, Samoa; L.53, the Islamic Republic of Iran; and L.54, Samoa.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, I shall call upon those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

I call first on the representative of Argentina to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.23.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The progress achieved in past years in the field of disarmament at the bilateral level has been recognized on many occasions. The establishment of constructive dialogue between the super-Powers has great creative potential inasmuch as it promotes a climate of détente and international co-operation. Despite this, and as stated in the Programme of Action in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, nuclear weapons still pose the greatest threat to mankind and to the survival of civilization. Therefore, the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, as well as the prevention of nuclear war, are questions that now, as in the past, call for priority attention.

On this occasion, as in past years, the delegation of Argentina is submitting a draft resolution concerning aspects of a fundamental question in the field of disarmament. The draft resolution, which is submitted under agenda item 60 (i) and (j) of our agenda, entitled "Cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament and prevention of nuclear war", is contained in document A/C.1/45/L.23. It has been submitted by my delegation and the delegations of Brazil, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, India, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Peru, the Sudan, Sweden, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The draft resolution in essence is substantially similar to the one adopted last year. By it the General Assembly would welcome the progress achieved in this field and reaffirm the complementarity between the bilateral and multilateral negotiations on disarmament.

The need to halt and reverse the arms race in order to avoid the outbreak of a nuclear war as long as these arsenals exist is a matter of the highest priority. It arouses the concern of the international community and, therefore, the vital and urgent interest in nuclear disarmament negotiations. Regrettably, the Conference

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

on Disarmament has been unable to deal appropriately with this question nor has it yet been able to arrive at an agreement to establish a subsidiary body with an appropriate mandate. By this resolution the General Assembly would therefore request the Conference on Disarmament to establish ad hoc committees at the beginning of its 1991 session on both of these questions in order to allow a structured and practical analysis of how the Conference on Disarmament can best contribute to progress on these two urgent matters.

My delegation hopes that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.23 will be adopted with the overwhelming support of the General Assembly.

I should like to take this opportunity to refer also to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.42, "Study on the role of the United Nations in the field of verification" - which was introduced by Sweden on 6 November 1990 and of which my delegation is a sponsor. The report of the Group of Experts whose responsibility it was to study the role of the United Nations in the field of verification, led to a number of conclusions that deserve mention. For example, in paragraph 257 it is stated that:

"... the Group concluded that the United Nations will need to address the multilateral aspects of verification with increasing attention."

This could be achieved through the establishment of a data bank and greater information activity as well as through its function as a depositary of disarmament instruments. Similarly, it considered the possibility that the United Nations would use aircraft and a satellite network for verification purposes as disarmament instruments. Together with these specific ideas, which seem more and more necessary with each passing day, the chapter entitled "Conclusions and recommendations" includes the possibility of creating an integrated system of international verification, pointing out that:

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

"... The same basic reasons which have led to a multilateral approach to certain arms limitation and disarmament questions also raise the issue of a multilateral framework to ensure the verification of resulting disarmament agreements." (A/45/372, para. 275)

Those of us who take an active part in the process of multilateral negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament are well aware of the importance of a multilateral system in the field of verification. It was for this and other reasons that, before the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the delegations of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden brought this idea to the highest levels in our respective Governments. It would be desirable for the General Assembly to request the Secretary-General to begin to implement the suggestions included in the study and we believe that the draft resolution is a step in the right direction.

Before I conclude, I should like to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.54, on regional centres for peace and disarmament, which was introduced yesterday by the delegation of Brazil. In that connection, we think it important to point out that we fully support the efforts that are being made to ensure that those centres should be the appropriate instruments for the promotion of the priorities established in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In that context, it is useful to remember that the regional centres are an integral part of the Department for Disarmament Affairs and that it is therefore important that, both in the administrative organization and in the planning of their activities, they should work in co-ordination with the Department for Disarmament Affairs and in consultation with the States in the region.

We believe that to be of primary importance for the success of the regional centres and their effectiveness and therefore hope that the draft resolution will be enthusiastically supported by the Committee.

MR. MOUSSA (Egypt): Mr. Chairman, though my delegation has had occasion to congratulate you on your election, I should like to add my personal felicitations since this is the first time I am addressing the Committee under your chairmanship.

The Middle East, as we are aware, continues to be a highly volatile conflict-torn region. Even in these times, when a rising tide of peace seems to be emerging in different regions of the world and globally, the situation in the Middle East remains a source of profound and intense concern. Recent developments have underscored the need to address the problems of the area promptly. Furthermore, they have brought to the forefront the importance and urgency of safeguarding the region from the ominous consequences associated with the introduction into the Middle East of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction - consequences with wide-ranging implications, not only for the prospects for stability and security in the region, but also for the maintenance of international peace and security in general.

Egypt has for over two decades been reiterating that security in the Middle East cannot sustain a nuclear dimension. We have cautioned that controversial or ambiguous nuclear programmes will generate an arms race in the nuclear field in the region, involving also other weapons of mass destruction, including, inter alia, chemical weapons.

On the first day that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was open for signature, we called upon the States of the region to adhere to it and to apply International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards to their nuclear facilities.

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

We have also constantly emphasized since then that the international community as a whole should strive to safeguard the region from the perils of a nuclear-arms race, not solely out of moral obligation but also out of self-interest.

Regrettably, more often than not these sincere exhortations have fallen on deaf ears or have been the victim of complacent attitudes and a preference for turning a blind eye to serious problems that warrant difficult decisions. As a result, the perils of the political crisis that we witness today have been greatly exacerbated and entail the potential use of different kinds of weapons of mass destruction.

It is worth noting that Egypt and other Arab States with significant nuclear programmes have met the standards universally acknowledged to amount to a legally binding determination not to acquire nuclear weapons, besides accepting and implementing the verification procedures essential to ensuring compliance with these commitments, through adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the application of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards to their nuclear facilities. Now it is of paramount importance that all States of the region adhere to the said Treaty and accept the application of full-scope IAEA safeguards to their nuclear facilities.

On 13 June 1988, before the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Foreign Minister of Egypt had the following to say:

> "From this rostrum I wish to call on Israel to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty and to place all its nuclear facilities under the system of inspection and verification of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), so that the peoples of the region may be sure that its nuclear programmes are not oriented towards military purposes. We reject the argument that the non-proliferation Treaty does not contribute to further stability,

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

and thereby to the prevention of conventional wars, nor is that argument an acceptable excuse for a State's not becoming a party to the Treaty." (A/S-15/PV.19, p. 28)

Israel has often repeated - most recently this week - arguments to the effect that progress in this field can be achieved only as part and parcel of the resolution of the political problems in the region. We earnestly hope that positive political developments in the region will become manifest in the near future, for they will undoubtedly enhance disarmament prospects. Can we, however, afford to wait? Should we allow nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction to proliferate in the region as we wait?

This brings me to a few fundamental points which I feel obliged to emphasize. First, no State, Israel, Arab or other, can find security in arms. The history of the Middle East clearly shows the futility of this assumption. Secondly, none of them can meet its security concerns at the expense of, or without addressing the security preoccupations of, the other States of the region. Thirdly, security in the Middle East can be nurtured only on the basis of equal reciprocal engagements by the States of the region. Fourthly, Israel must bring its commitments in the nuclear-weapon field into line with those of Arab States by adhering to the NPT. From that point on the States of the region can work together to develop more efficient and effective measures to ensure that nuclear weapons are not introduced into the region. Fifthly, for a number of years now the respective States of the region have been emphasizing and giving priority to different weapons systems in the disarmament equation, while ignoring the concerns of others. The initiative declared by President Mubarak of Egypt on 8 April 1990 concerning the establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East was a sincere attempt to address the primary concerns of the various States of the region. Sixthly, it can also be logically concluded that States of the Middle East, like

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

all other States, in determining whether to adhere to global or universal disarmament agreements, will take into account, first and foremost, their direct security concerns, which are more often than not governed by the prevailing situation in their region. Consequently, States outside the Middle East have a vested interest in encouraging the States of the region to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, not only for its positive implications for their own security, as well as that of the Middle East, but also to ensure that the States of the region are active contributors to the global disarmament talks.

As I have said previously, for a number of decades Egypt has attempted to encourage the States of the Middle East to refrain from indulging in a nuclear-arms race. The Committee has before it at this session a study prepared by the Secretary-General on "Effective and verifiable measures to facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East" (A/45/435).

This comes as a result of our efforts to make full use of the good offices of the Secretary-General in order to inject an impetus into the process, particularly given the intricate political situation prevailing in the region, which does not augur well for the direct interaction of most of the States thereof. Since the initiative for the establishment of the zone emanates from the region, and since the States and the region have rallied behind it, joining in the consensus on General Assembly resolutions on that issue from 1980 onwards, Egypt felt, and continues to believe, that the opportunities provided for by the Secretary-General, as well as other options within the United Nations system, can be used to advantage in these endeavours, without prejudice to the basic tenets that govern regional initiatives or to the positions of the respective parties. Actually, Egypt believes that we are all duty-bound to make full use of these possibilities and not allow the burdens of political strife in the Middle East to overwhelm us.

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

I would like to take this opportunity to express Egypt's sincere appreciation to all those who participated in undertaking the study: first of all, to the Secretary-General and his three consultants, Mr. James Leonard of the United States, Mr. Benjamin Sanders of the Netherlands and Mr. Jan Prawitz of Sweden, as well as to Under-Secretary-General Akashi and his staff members, Mr. Davinic and Ms. Silvana da Silva. They have made a thought-provoking, balanced and interesting contribution to the process of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Egypt intends to give careful consideration to the ideas discussed in the study, to the conclusions reached and to the elements in the annex. We call upon other States to do the same. We urge the Committee to look at the proposals with an open mind and consider how to work with them, rather than devalue the study by using it casually as a source of selective quotes in order to bolster already enunciated national positions. We urge the Committee to keep in mind that progress in this field will be achieved only through mutual satisfaction. Most of all we urge the Committee to consider how to move forward and what follow-up measures are possible.

With these thoughts in mind, Egypt has submitted to the First Committee this year draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.1, of 29 October 1990, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East". The draft resolution aims to preserve all the elements of previous years' resolutions that were adopted without a vote. Editorial updates have been made where necessary and States have been requested to provide their views on the Secretary-General's study and what follow-up measures are envisaged. We hope that it will receive the same support as have similar draft resolutions on previous occasions and will be adopted without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Nigeria, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.2/Rev.1.

Mr. AZIKIWE (Nigeria): I should like to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.2/Rev.1 on behalf of the delegations of Costa Rica and Nigeria. The draft resolution concerns the Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade. The objective of this draft resolution is that the General Assembly should adopt the elements of the Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade as recommended by the Disarmament Commission at its 1990 substantive session and as set forth in the annex to the draft resolution.

The elements of the Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade as endorsed by the Disarmament Commission are addressed to the international community and deal essentially with the hopes and aspirations of peoples for lasting peace and security. The draft Declaration stresses the need for the international community to stimulate and deepen its awareness of the common interests of the global community and of the universal interest in achieving disarmament and strengthening international peace and security.

It also recognizes that the international community stands on common ground in its determination to make progress in the 1990s by resolutely pursuing disarmament along with other efforts necessary for attaining genuine peace and security.

More important, it urges the United Nations to continue to foster multilateral co-operation for disarmament wherein bilateral and regional efforts can be complementary and mutually supportive in attaining the purposes and principles of the United Nations. Pursuant to this draft resolution, the Secretary-General would be requested to report to the General Assembly as and when necessary on the progress made in the implementation of the Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade.

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

This draft resolution is not contentious and the elements of the Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade, which this draft resolution seeks to support were agreed by consensus at the Disarmament Commission. However, following consultations with interested delegations, some amendments were agreed upon and these are now featured in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.2/Rev.1. I would therefore recommend that the Committee adopt draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.2/Rev.1 without a vote.

I wish to comment also on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.15, concerning the United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services programme, which is sponsored by 23 countries, including Nigeria. The draft resolution has the same elements as the corresponding resolution of last year, except that it updates the developments in that regard. I wish to take this opportunity to convey Nigeria's appreciation to the Secretary-General and to the Department for Disarmament Affairs for the effective manner in which they have implemented the programme.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than in explanation of their position on the drafts in cluster 1.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States delegation wishes to announce that we will not participate in whatever action the First Committee takes on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.4 in cluster 1, which deals with disarmament and development. As everyone knows, the United States believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that cannot be considered as organically linked. Consequently, the United States does not participate in the International Conference on this matter.

The United States delegation requests that the record of today's proceedings reflect the fact that the United States has not participated in the consideration of, or action on, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.4, on disarmament and development.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

At the same time, our delegation takes this opportunity to state again that the United States Government does not, and will not, consider itself bound by the declarations in the Final Document of the International Conference.

The CHAIRMAN: As there are no delegations wishing to explain their position before a decision is taken on the draft texts in cluster 1, we shall now proceed to take a decision on each of them.

The first draft resolution, A/C.1/45/L.2/Rev.1, is entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November 1990.

Before proceeding to take a decision I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.2/Rev.1 has the following sponsors: Costa Rica and Nigeria.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.2/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/45/L.3, entitled "General and complete disarmament: international arms transfers". This draft decision was introduced by the representative of Colombia at the 25th meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1990.

Before proceeding to take action on the decision, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsor of this draft decision is Colombia.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsor of this draft decision has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/45/L.3 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.4, entitled "General and complete disarmament: Relationship between disarmament and development".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations which are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1990.

Before we proceed to take a decision, I shall call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Mr. Chairman, as you have noted, this draft resolution was submitted by Yugoslavia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations which are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.4 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/45/L.34, entitled "General and complete disarmament" and subtitled "Information on arms control and disarmament agreements".

(The Chairman)

This draft decision was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland at the 26th meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1990.

Before we take a decision, I shall call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The list of sponsors of the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/45/L.34 is as follows: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, Samoa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Venezuela.

With regard to this draft decision (A/C.1/45/L.34), entitled "General and complete disarmament" and subtitled "Information on arms control and disarmament agreements", I should like to make the following oral statement on behalf of the Secretary-General:

By the terms of that draft decision, the General Assembly would invite the Secretary-General, making use of existing resources and voluntary contributions, to compile from information voluntarily provided by the relevant Member States and to make available on request appropriate information on multilateral and bilateral arms-control and disarmament agreements, with the aim of providing an easily available source of texts and measures used in such agreements.

In carrying out this task, the Department for Disarmament Affairs would collect such information as may be provided by the relevant Member States and respond to requests received to the best of its ability within existing resources, supplemented by voluntary contributions.

(Mr. Kheradi)

It is difficult to assess the additional work-load this task might entail, but it is anticipated that there would be no additional programme-budget implications for the biennium 1990-1991.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/45/L.34, entitled "General and complete disarmament" and subtitled "Information on arms control and disarmament agreements". The sponsors of this draft decision have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/45/L.34 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.36, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: Implementation of the guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 25th meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1990.

Before we take a decision, I shall call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.36 is as follows: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Spain, Togo, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.36 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions after the decisions just taken on all draft resolutions listed in Cluster 1.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): My delegation wishes to explain Japan's position on resolution L.36, just adopted, and also on draft resolution L.37, in cluster 3, which also deals with confidence-building measures in Europe, on which voting will take place later.

Japan wholeheartedly welcomes and strongly admires the progress being made in the field of confidence- and security-building measures and the reduction of conventional forces in Europe, which demonstrates the level of sophistication and wisdom in overcoming confrontation and enhancing regional security.

Such progress was only a part of the much larger process of an across-the-board dialogue, and became possible only with the development of mutual confidence and trust among European nations, which in turn had to be fostered over the years through repeated contacts among the top-level leaders as well as numerous energetic negotiations at various working levels.

When we consider the possible applicability of confidence-building measures in any particular region, we must first give serious thought, and not in abstract but in specific terms, to what concrete actions will be necessary in order to reduce and eliminate mutual distrust among the nations concerned.

In that connection Japan wishes to stress the importance of the view expressed in paragraph 1 of resolution L.36, where, in recommending the guidelines to all States for implementation, it is pointed out that specific political, military and other conditions prevailing in a region should be fully taken into account.

In East Asia there still remain a number of issues and sources of tension, such as territorial issues and ongoing regional conflicts. Therefore we ought first to make steady efforts to enhance mutual confidence among nations concerned

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

by solving those issues and conflicts one by one. It is through such efforts that we may bring about enhanced mutual confidence among nations in the region, which in turn would pave the way for adopting some of the European experience in confidence- and security-building measures.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 2. I shall now call on those delegations that wish to make a statement other than in explanation of vote.

Miss RIVERA (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): As this is the first time Costa Rica has spoken, I should like to offer you, Sir, my sincere congratulations on your election as Chairman. We are sure that your experience and personal qualities guarantee the success of our work in the struggle for world peace and disarmament.

I wish to express our support for the draft resolution in document A/C.1/45/L.29 on the World Disarmament Campaign, sponsored by Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Egypt, Indonesia, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

My country has today become a sponsor of this draft resolution. Costa Rica wishes, as is said in paragraph 2, to commend the Secretary-General for his efforts to make effective use of the resources available to him in disseminating as widely as possible information on arms limitation and disarmament to elected officials, the media, non-governmental organizations, educational comunities and research institutes, and in carrying out an active seminar and conference programme.

Thanks to the World Disarmament Campaign, which was so effectively disseminated throughout the world, I am happy to inform the Committee that from 23 to 26 October 1989 Costa Rica marked Disarmament Week for the first time. It was promoted by the School of International Relations of the Andres Bello College

(Miss Rivera, Costa Rica)

of the Autonomous University of Central America, under the patronage of the President of the Republic of Costa Rica and the School of Political Science and International Relations of Costa Rica.

Costa Rica welcomes that kind of activity within the context of the World Disarmament Campaign because it believes that through information and education on matters relating to disarmament it is possible to make world public opinion - and by that I mean both national and international public opinion - better aware of the processes of regional peacemaking.

For that reason Costa Rica joins in the efforts promoted by the Campaign to inform, educate and make public opinion aware of the importance of supporting multilateral action, including the action of the United Nations and the Conference on Disarmament, in the area of arms limitation and disarmament in a concrete and well-balanced manner, while facilitating access to the exchange of ideas and information between the public sector, interested groups and institutions, and providing concrete information covering the whole spectrum of opinion in order to promote a well-informed discussion on arms limitation, disarmament and security, and to support the organization of meetings to promote exchanges of ideas, opinions and information between governmental and non-governmental sectors, and between government experts and others in order to assist in the search for a common criterion.

My delegation requests all States members of the Committee to support this draft resolution, and to include in the provisional programme for the forty-sixth session the item "World Disarmament Campaign".

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take decisions on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 2, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.15, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services programmes".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.15 has the following sponsors: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Kenya, Indonesia, Liberia, Morocco, Myanmar, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, Senegal, Sudan, Sweden, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Zaire.

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Nigeria.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.15 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.29, entitled "World Disarmament Campaign". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.29 has the following sponsors: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Costa Rica, Egypt, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Peru, the Philippines, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.29 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.54, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific and United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Brazil at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.54 are the following: Brazil, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, China, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Tunisia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, Viet Nam and Yemen.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.54 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their positions on any or all of the draft resolutions in cluster 2.

Mr. AMIGUES (France) (interpretation from French): I wish to refer to two of the draft resolutions that we have just adopted, namely, A/C.1/45/L.29 and L.54.

(Mr. Amigues, France)

The French delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.29 relating to the World Disarmament Campaign. It was able to do so because of what we considered to be a considerable improvement in the text submitted this year to our Committee.

My delegation wishes to recall that France makes a significant contribution to the activities of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), especially by important financial support. Thus, it participates in the efforts of the international community in the area of scientific research in the field of disarmament, one of the fundamental aspects of the World Disarmament Campaign. My delegation expresses its satisfaction at the announcement made by a number of delegations that an important part of their contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign should be reserved for the UNIDIR budget.

(Mr. Amigues, France)

The French delegation also joined in the wide support for draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.54 on the United Nations Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to recall that in 1990 France announced its decision to make a voluntary contribution of 50,000 French francs to the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa. We wish to state today that this 50,000-franc contribution will also be made in 1991, thus enabling the Lomé Centre, in co-operation with the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, to draw up a draft proposal for developing data bases for the research centres for security and disarmament in Africa and to improve their connections.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): My delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.15, "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services programme". Japan considers that the United Nations fellowship programme is very important in promoting expertise in disarmament among future leaders, in particular from developing countries.

At the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1982, Japan proposed inviting the participants in the programme to make a study visit to Japan, including Hiroshima and Nagasaki. On the basis of that proposal we have received a number of participants every year since 1983. I wish to inform the Committee that this year again, as last year, Japan was happy to welcome the participants in this programme to Japan. Japan is willing to continue to co-operate with this programme in the future.

Mr. KENYON (United Kingdom): We were glad to join in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.29, "World Disarmament Campaign". We agree with the thrust of the Secretary-General's recent report on the Campaign and endorse the welcome for it expressed in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

Our support for the draft resolution should be interpreted in this light and not as a commitment to provide a voluntary contribution to the Campaign, since we already support this through our contribution to the regular budget.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take decisions on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 3.

There are no requests to make statements of position or in explanation of vote before the decisions are taken. The Committee will therefore proceed to take decisions, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.6, "General and complete disarmament: conventional disarmament". The draft resolution, sponsored by China, was introduced by its representative at the Committee's 31st meeting, on 8 November 1990. The sponsor has expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.6 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.20, "General and complete disarmament: conventional disarmament". The draft resolution, sponsored by Denmark, was introduced by its representative at the Committee's 24th meeting, on 2 November 1990. The sponsor has expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.20 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.37, "General and complete disarmament: Confidence- and security-building measures and conventional disarmament in Europe". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of France at the Committee's 26th meeting, on 5 November 1990.

(The Chairman)

I shall now call upon the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.37 are: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.37 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to do so.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.37 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.47 entitled "Convention on prohibition or restrictions on the use of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 29th meeting, on 7 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.47 is sponsored by the following delegations: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.47 have requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.47 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/45/L.48 entitled "General and complete disarmament: conventional disarmament on a regional scale". The draft decision was introduced by the representative of Peru at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the First Committee): The draft decision in document A/C.1/45/L.48 is sponsored by Peru.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsor of this draft decision has expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/45/L.48 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions after the decisions just taken on all the draft resolutions listed in cluster 3.

Mr. EDOGAR (United States of America): The United States gladly joins in the consensus on draft decision L. 48 on conventional disarmament on a regional scale. The United States is a strong supporter of this approach. However, its joining in the consensus does not signify approval of resolution 44/116 S of 15 December 1989, which the decision recalls and which the United States opposed.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now completed taking decisions on three clusters, as was planned for this morning's meeting. Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform the Committee that the next meeting of the First Committee will take place on Monday, at 10.30 a.m., in Conference Room 1.

With regard to the programme of work for Monday, I wish to inform the Committee that we shall be taking up, for decision, all draft resolutions under the agenda items listed in cluster 4, except A/C.1/45/L.38; similarly, all those listed in cluster 5, except A/C.1/45/L.5, A/C.1/45/L.35 and A/C.1/45/L.43. In addition, we shall also take up draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.44 on Monday.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
34th meeting
held on
Monday, 12 November 1990
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 34th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. RANA (Nepal)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of and action on draft resolutions (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/45/PV.34
3 December 1990
ENGLISH

90-63208 2810V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 66 AND 155 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

The CHAIRMAN: I informed delegations on Friday that this morning the Committee would first take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.44, and subsequently would take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4 - namely, A/C.1/45/L.11, A/C.1/45/L.16, A/C.1/45/L.27/Rev.1, and A/C.1/45/L.40. Action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 in cluster 4 has been deferred to a later stage. However, I have been approached by the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.11 and A/C.1/45/L.40 with a request that consideration of those drafts be postponed in order to allow for further consultations among interested delegations.

After completing action on those draft resolutions, the Committee will move on to take action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 5 - namely, resolutions A/C.1/45/L.7, A/C.1/45/L.14, A/C.1/45/L.23, A/C.1/45/L.25 and A/C.1/45/L.33. As I have informed the Committee, action on the remaining draft resolutions in that cluster - namely, A/C.1/45/L.5, A/C.1/45/L.35 and A/C.1/45/L.43 has been deferred to a later stage.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/45/L.44: Benin and Hungary; L.51: Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Guinea, Madagascar, Mauritania, Norway, Poland, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Swaziland and Turkey; L.41: Hungary; L.43: Hungary; and L.44: New Zealand.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Poland, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1.

Mr. PAWLAK (Poland): Today I have the honour of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". In addition to Canada and Poland, the following 41 Member States are also sponsors: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Viet Nam.

As has been the case with similar draft resolutions, the object of this draft resolution is to record major developments relevant to its subject-matter that have taken place since the last session of the General Assembly, in particular those related to the negotiations on a chemical weapons convention in the Conference on Disarmament, and to express the determination of Member States to conclude as expeditiously as possible, and subsequently to implement, a global, comprehensive and verifiable convention eliminating chemical weapons once and for all from the face of the Earth.

For years the draft resolution on this subject has enjoyed the unanimous support of Member States. The sponsors believe that this support will continue, since adoption of the present draft resolution by consensus would be an important indication of the deep concern shared by Member States over the existence of chemical weapons and, as demonstrated recently, the growing danger of their use. At the same time, it will send a strong message to the Conference on Disarmament about the urgent need to complete its work on the convention.

(Mr. Pawlak, Poland)

The draft resolution is essentially based on last year's resolution 44/115 A, which was adopted by consensus. However, the authors and sponsors have made a number of modifications reflecting, inter alia, significant developments which have taken place over the past year. We have also introduced some changes in several paragraphs to make the draft resolution more dynamic and forward-looking.

For those reasons, in general, we have modified and updated the second, fifth and seventh preambular paragraphs. The new third preambular paragraph replaces the previous preambular paragraphs referring to the Paris Conference.

Believing that the growing participation by observer States can significantly contribute to the attainment of universal accession to the convention, we have accordingly modified the seventh preambular paragraph.

The new tenth preambular paragraph addresses the recent Soviet-American agreement on ceasing the production, and beginning the destruction, of their chemical-weapon stockpiles.

The new twelfth preambular paragraph expresses appreciation to States which have declared their intention to be among the original signatories to the convention.

We have added a new operative paragraph 1, which reflects the desirability in the current political situation of renewing the call upon States both to observe the 1925 Geneva Protocol and to abide by the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference.

Operative paragraphs 2 and 3 have been modified to reflect the degree of progress achieved by the Conference on Disarmament in its last negotiating session, which many members found less than fully satisafactory.

Operative paragraph 4 has been modified to strengthen the draft resolution and make it more dynamic. It is now clearer and cleaner in its call for the Conference on Disarmament to take action expeditiously.

(Mr. Pawlak, Poland)

Operative paragraph 6 has been amplified further to stress the importance of declarations made by States on whether or not they possess chemical weapons and of further international exchanges of data and other relevant information in connection with the negotiations on the convention.

Operative paragraph 7 has been made clearer, and is supplemented by new operative paragraph 8, which invites all States to make every effort to ensure the early entry into force and effective implementation of a future convention. New operative paragraph 9 is self-explanatory.

The draft resolution is the result of very intensive and broad consultations among many delegations, all of which have demonstrated a commendable spirit of co-operation and goodwill, as well as a spirit of compromise. In this connection, I take this opportunity to express my delegation's sincere gratitude to the delegation of Canada, which has co-operated with us very closely on the draft resolution. I should also like, on behalf of our two delegations, to express our great appreciation to all the sponsors, as well as to other delegations which actively participated in the negotiations, for their valuable contribution to the elaboration of this draft resolution.

The spirit of co-operation prevailing during the negotiations allows us to believe that it will be the wish of Member States to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1 by consensus. If so, the Organization will firmly demonstrate its commitment to freeing the world of these utterly repugnant weapons of mass destruction. Moreover, I am convinced that it will also contribute greatly to accelerating the work of the Conference on Disarmament on a convention on chemical weapons.

Mr. MORRIS (Australia): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.52, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol".

The following Member States have joined Australia in sponsoring the draft resolution: Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

Last year Australia introduced draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.47/Rev.1, on measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and to support the conclusion of a chemical weapons convention. That draft resolution, which was subsequently adopted by consensus as resolution 44/115 B, built upon two previous consensus resolutions, resolutions 43/74 A and 42/37 C, which reflected in the strongest terms the international commitment to the 1925 Protocol and to the early conclusion of a comprehensive and effective chemical weapons convention. They also built on that commitment in a practical way by requesting the Secretary-General to develop, with the assistance of a group of qualified experts, technical guidelines and procedures for the timely and efficient investigation of reports of the possible use of chemical and bacteriological (biological) or toxin weapons.

The sponsors of resolution 44/115 B believed that it was important and appropriate that the international community, through the United Nations, and especially in the light of the clear and significant political commitments made at

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

the Paris Conference in January 1989, should follow up by making its own declaration through another resolution in the General Assembly, to demonstrate once and for all its common objective of ensuring that chemical weapons are never used again.

It is with growing alarm, therefore, that we note that the risk of chemical weapons use seems to be escalating, despite those firm international legal and political commitments not to use them.

Accordingly, in the second preambular pargraph of draft resolution L.52 the Assembly would reaffirm resolution 44/115 B as a whole. In the fourth preambular paragraph, it would deplore without equivocation the use and threat of use of chemical weapons. Accordingly it would condemn vigorously, in operative paragraph 1, all actions that violate or threaten to violate obligations assumed under the 1925 Geneva Protocol and other relevant provisions of international law.

In focusing on use and the threat of use, the Assembly, in operative paragraph 2, would renew its call to all States to observe strictly the principles and objectives of the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

In operative paragraph 3 it would complete the task set out in operative paragraph 5 of resolution 42/37 C by endorsing the proposals of the group of qualified experts established in pursuance of that resolution concerning technical guidelines and procedures to guide the Secretary-General in the conduct of the investigation of reports of the use of chemical and bacteriological (biological) or toxin weapons.

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

Finally, and again in connection with chemical weapons use, under the draft resolution the Assembly would take note of the continuing significance of the Security Council decision to consider immediately, taking into account the Secretary-General's investigations, appropriate and effective measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, should there be any future use of chemical weapons, in violation of international law.

Clearly the most definitive and effective way to ensure that such weapons are not used again is through the conclusion of a global and comprehensive chemical weapons convention. This very short and focused draft resolution should therefore be seen as complementary to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1, which was just introduced by my colleague from Poland. It reflects in a direct and clear way international concern about the horrendous and futile pain and suffering that the use of these abominable and internationally reviled weapons will cause.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.52 is, again, the result of long and careful consultations with a broad range of interested delegations. Discussions commenced within a core group of countries, including the sponsors of last year's text. We subsequently consulted with all regional groups and interested parties. The Australian delegation wishes to express its deep appreciation for the constructive and fruitful co-operation and assistance extended to it by all delegations.

In this context it is important to note that the overriding and common objective of all those who particpated in this process was to achieve again a consensus draft resolution with an unequivocal and substantive message. I commend, therefore, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.52 to the First Committee for adoption without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.27/Rev.1.

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Today my delegation has the honour of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.27/Rev.1, "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons". We do so on behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Austria, Benin, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, India, Italy, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, the Netherlands, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The purpose of the draft resolution is to establish an agreed international procedure to make possible continuous monitoring of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. It would also provide for the making, when necessary, of recommendations on undertaking specific negotiations on the identified types of such weapons. Those proposals are contained in operative paragraphs 2 and 3.

In the course of our work on the draft resolution my delegation held consultations with a wide range of other delegations, which made it possible to reflect in the revised text all the positions expressed. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to express our sincere gratitude to all those who participated in the consultations, and our special gratitude to those delegations that agreed to become sponsors of the draft resolution.

On behalf of all the sponsors I should like to express the hope that the revised draft resolution will be adopted without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: There are no delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of their position on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.44 before a decision is taken on it.

(The Chairman)

The Committee will therefore proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.44. This draft resolution is entitled "General and complete disarmament," and subtitled "Regional disarmament, including confidence-building measures". It was introduced by the representative of Belgium at an earlier meeting. I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.44 are: Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Suriname, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.44 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon representatives who wish to speak in explanation of their position on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.44.

Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.44, which the Committee has just adopted, because we consider the question of regional disarmament and confidence-building measures to be of great importance. However, my delegation would like to place it on record that it would have wished the text of the draft resolution to contain a clearer statement of some ideas it considers to be important. For example, we think that regional disarmament measures can contribute

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

effectively to the general process of arms reduction and disarmament, but that it would have been useful to make it quite clear that such measures can contribute effectively to the process when promoted by the States of the region themselves, taking into account their own characteristics. That can be done only in an atmosphere of confidence based on mutual respect, if the best response is to be ensured.

There is no doubt that justice, solidarity and co-operation are of great validity. However, there are times when those terms are not given the same meaning by all. We would have preferred to make it quite clear that regional disarmament can take place only in an atmosphere of confidence based on mutual respect and channelled towards the best possible relations.

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

This is so when there is no use or threat of the use of force against States, when there is respect for the territorial integrity of such States, and non-interference in their internal affairs. All of this contributes to the peaceful settlement of such disputes.

Finally, with regard to the idea underlying operative paragraph 1, it is beyond question that a regional approach to disarmament is one of the essential elements in global efforts. It seems to me that we should have added some ideas to complete the text, within the context of general and complete disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on two of the draft resolutions in cluster 4, namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.16 and A/C.1/45/L.27/Rev.1. The remaining draft resolutions in this cluster are deferred until a later stage.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on these draft resolutions I call on those delegations wishing to make a statement on draft resolutions in this cluster.

Ms. AL-MULLA (Kuwait): My delegation would like to confine its comments to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/45/L.11, which was introduced by the delegation of Iraq on 8 November.

My delegation has serious difficulties with a draft resolution that has as its title "Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons". Our difficulty is basically with the elements left out of the draft resolution.

Let me explain also that Kuwait had in the past voted for such a draft resolution. We continue to support the basic thesis that nuclear facilities intended solely for peaceful purposes shall not be subjected to armed attack. We condemned the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear facility in 1982. However, the

(Ms. Al-Mulla, Kuwait)

text now before us seems to be a little bit out of date. Certain elements will have to be included without touching the basic elements of the text. We would like to see some additions to the draft resolution.

To be specific, we would like to propose that the reference to Additional Protocol I of 1977 to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 should not be restricted to attacks on nuclear electricity-generating stations, but should also include a reference to prohibition of the taking of hostages. We would like that preambular paragraph to be expanded to include that reference.

We would also like to see a reference in the preamble and in the operative part to the effect that the holding of civilians hostage, irrespective of their nationality, and in line with Additional Protocol I, around military and industrial targets, is not permitted, and that in placing them around these targets, it exposes them to danger, including radioactive contamination.

Perhaps the whole thrust of this draft resolution is served by another draft resolution which is before the Committee, namely draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, entitled "Prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities". Perhaps that would address the whole subject.

As I have said, Kuwait cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.11 as it has been presented. We feel compelled to put these ideas before the Committee in the hope that the Iraqi delegation may be able to incorporate some of them into draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.11. We have already submitted these amendments in writing and I hope that delegations will have the opportunity to come forward and support them.

The CHAIRMAN: I would request that the amendments be submitted to the Secretary in writing.

As there are no other delegations that wish to make a statement on this cluster, and as no delegations wish to explain their position before a decision is taken on the draft resolutions in cluster 4, I now propose to take a decision on the draft resolutions in cluster 4, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.16, entitled "General and complete disarmament: prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the 24th meeting of the First Committee on 2 November 1990.

I call now on the Secretary of the Committee who will read out the list of co-sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The list of sponsors for draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.16 is as follows: the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Germany, Hungary, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Sweden.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.16 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.27/Rev.1, entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament".

The draft resolution was introduced this morning by the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Before we proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution, I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The list of sponsors for draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.27/Rev.1 is as follows: Afghanistan, Austria, Benin, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, India, Italy, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, the Netherlands, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britian and Northern Ireland and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.27/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on any delegation wishing to explain its position after the decisions that have just been taken on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 4.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States was pleased to join the consensus this year on draft resolution L.27/Rev.1, on the "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons".

However, we wish the record to reflect that the United States has not identified any new types of such weapons, and we do not believe anyone else has either. Moreover, we do not believe this draft resolution has the intent of restricting defence research programmes.

Finally, if any new weapon of mass destruction is found in the future, its control, limitation or elimination could then be addressed with full account taken of the requirement for effective verification.

The CHAIRMAN: As previously announced, we shall now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 5 - namely, A/C.1/45/L.7, L.14, L.23, L.25 and L.33.

As I informed the Committee earlier, action on the remaining draft resolutions in this cluster - namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.5, L.35 and L.43 - has been deferred to a later stage.

Since there are no delegations wishing to make a statement other than an explanation of position on draft resolutions contained in this cluster, I shall now call on any delegation wishing to explain its position before decisions are taken on draft resolutions listed in cluster 5.

Mr. GAJDA (Hungary): At this juncture the Hungarian delegation wishes to explain its position on three draft resolutions in cluster 5.

Let me mention first of all that, as in preceding years, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.23 contains a great number of noble ideas and statements all of which we can easily agree with. We can only hope that the truly positive approach that is mirrored in the text will be characteristic also of attitudes in the everyday practice of negotiations on the subject. With that in mind, we shall vote in favour of that draft resolution.

The Hungarian delegation has been carefully studying the draft resolution contained in document L.25, concerning a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

It is common knowledge in this body, as it is beyond these walls, that Hungary is totally opposed to nuclear weapons and, consequently, is a willing partner to any effort that can lead to their complete and final elimination. We are not convinced, however, that the convention promoted by this draft resolution is realistic enough to be accorded priority by the Conference on Disarmament. As long as the parties involved continue the practice of engaging in monologues, time and energy will be taken away from other, more realistic subjects. For that reason the Hungarian delegation will, with some reluctance, abstain in the vote on this draft resolution.

My delegation's position on draft resolution L.33, on a nuclear-arms freeze, will, again, show a departure from past practice. This document reflects a concept that is clearly outdated and is out of tune with the developments in bilateral negotiations. In addition, our fundamental opposition to nuclear weapons leads us to demand more than a freeze in a certain situation. My delegation will therefore abstain when it is put to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions contained in cluster 5, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.7, entitled "General and complete disarmament: nuclear disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of China at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1990.

(The Chairman)

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.7 is China.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.7 has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. As I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.7 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.14, entitled "General and complete disarmament: comprehensive United Nations study on nuclear weapons". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 24th meeting of the Committee, on 2 November 1990.

I now call on the Secretary to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.14 is Sweden.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.14 has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. As I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.14 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.23, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament and prevention of nuclear war". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Argentina at the 33rd meeting of the Committee, on 9 November 1990.

I now call on the Secretary to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.23 are Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Peru, the Sudan, Sweden, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Norway, Poland, Romania

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.23 was adopted by 112 votes to 12, with 9 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.25, entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly: convention on the prohibition

(The Chairman)

of the use of nuclear weapons". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the 29th meeting of the Committee on 7 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.25 are Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Poland, Romania

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.25 was adopted by 106 votes to 17, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.33, entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly: nuclear-arms freeze". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 25th meeting of the First Committee, held on 5 November 1990.

I call on the Committee Secretary.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.33 is sponsored by the following delegations: Bolivia, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Myanmar, Peru and the Sudan.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested, but owing to a malfunction of the voting machine I propose now to suspend the meeting.

The meeting was suspended at 12.05 p.m. and resumed at 12.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I apologize for the interruption caused by technical problems.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I, too, apologize that a problem has arisen, owing purely to a technical, mechanical failure. I might add that I am glad we were not voting on any draft resolutions on science and technology.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.33. As I stated earlier, a recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Bulgaria, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, Poland, Romania

The draft resolution was adopted by 107 votes to 14, with 12 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on delegations that wish to explain their positions on draft resolutions in cluster 5.

Mr. MORRIS (Australia): Australia would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.23, entitled "Cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament and prevention of nuclear war". The draft resolution deals with the role of the Conference on Disarmament with respect to the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and, clearly, the prevention of nuclear war.

Australia supports consideration of the issue by the Conference on Disarmament, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating body, in whatever format the Conference decides is appropriate. We note that the draft resolution calls for the establishment of ad hoc committees, to which Australia would not object if consensus to do so existed. We also note, however, that the Conference on Disarmament has alternative methods at its disposal, including the use of informal meetings, to discuss the substance of the questions, methods that were used, for example, during the 1990 session.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.33, on a nuclear-arms freeze.

Over the years Japan has made consistent efforts at the United Nations and various other international forums in pursuit of nuclear disarmament, with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons. Japan also whole-heartedly welcomes the recent remarkable progress made in the field of nuclear disarmament by the United States and the Soviet Union.

On the other hand, while following the road towards the realization of nuclear disarmament, Japan considers that we should not lose sight of the present situation in the world, in which nuclear deterrence continues to play an important role in maintaining world peace and security.

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

For these reasons Japan has doubts about the practicability or meaningfulness of the proposal concerning a nuclear-arms freeze upon which we have just voted. A freeze on nuclear arms means the preservation of the real or perceived nuclear superiority of one side over the other, unless it is backed up by a reliable and well-prepared arrangement that will ensure a balanced reduction in nuclear arms. Therefore, a nuclear-arms freeze cannot by itself be a contributory factor to international peace and stability.

Furthermore, on the question of verification raised in the draft resolution's sixth preambular paragraph, my delegation understands that in regard to a nuclear freeze enforcement of verification is extremely difficult. Of course, a mere declaration of a nuclear-arms freeze without effective means of verification would not be very meaningful.

Those are the basic reasons why Japan voted against draft resolution L.33.

Mr. AMIGUES (France) (interpretation from French): As in the case of last year's draft resolution with regard to a nuclear-arms freeze, I should like to state France's reason for voting against draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.33. Our objections relate to the very concept of the freeze and have been expressed on many occasions.

First, a freeze would by definition tend to fix existing situations and, therefore, the imbalances that such situations may entail and the resultant security risks for the States concerned. Furthermore, a freeze might be tantamount to giving any State that significantly increased its armaments a lasting advantage, to the detriment of States that might have reduced their efforts.

In addition, a freeze would be very difficult to verify, and the establishment of an effective mechanism for verifying an arms freeze would require negotiations that would be no less lengthy or complicated than in the case of an agreement on actual arms reduction. Lastly, a freeze, to the extent that it might benefit a

(Mr. Amigues, France)

given Power, might considerably reduce that Power's interest in negotiations, and thus its readiness to enter seriously into negotiations on the reduction of armaments.

Consequently, progress towards the reduction of nuclear arsenals would in no way be promoted by statements aimed at bringing about a freeze. The path towards such reductions is one that requires, in its initial phase, negotiations between the two major nuclear Powers, beginning with the definition and establishment of a satisfactory balance.

France hopes that, in light of the developments in the international situation, the sponsors of the draft resolution will in the future recognize the outmoded and inapplicable nature of the concept of a nuclear-arms freeze.

Mr. PAWLAK (Poland): I should like to explain the vote of the Polish delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.25, "Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons".

Poland is in general in favour of the objectives set forth in that draft resolution, namely, reduction of the threat of nuclear war and prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. However, we have certain doubts as to whether the draft convention annexed to draft resolution L.25, in its present form, can realistically be acceptable to and considered by the Conference on Disarmament as a practical disarmament measure. For that reason, Poland reluctantly abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. ELM (Sweden): The Swedish delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.25, "Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons".

Sweden voted in favour of draft resolution L.25, which was introduced by the representative of India. We have done so, as with similar draft resolutions in

(Mr. Elm, Sweden)

previous years, because Sweden supports the concept of the prohibition in an international legal instrument of the use and threat of use of nuclear weapons. It seems that such a prohibition corresponds to an emerging international norm according to which the use of nuclear weapons contravenes the laws of humanity and the dictates of public conscience. Already many rules of international law limit or prohibit the use of nuclear weapons in certain circumstances. Sweden considers that the time is ripe for an investigation into the possibilities of comprehensively banning, in an appropriate, legally binding form, the use of nuclear weapons.

Since the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons cannot be inferred from the Charter of the United Nations, Sweden has reservations concerning the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution and its interpretation of the Charter.

Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland): I wish to speak to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.33, "Nuclear-arms freeze". This year my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution on this subject, for two basic reasons.

In our view, the idea of a nuclear-arms freeze was a viable approach to nuclear disarmament as long as the nuclear-arms race went on unabated and the number of nuclear weapons was on the increase, with no prospect of reductions. That was the situation in the early 1980s. It was in light of that sombre situation that Finland supported the freeze approach and the corresponding draft resolutions in the past. Today, however, the situation is different. Real reductions in nuclear weapons have been agreed upon and implemented. Further reductions are in the offing. A freeze in this situation would not move the process of nuclear disarmament forward. Indeed, it would freeze it. That is why

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

we have had growing misgivings about the draft resolution on this subject for some time, and that is why this year we have decided that we can no longer support it.

Further, we have always been slightly troubled by the considerable redundancy evident in the draft resolution. Issues such as the non-production of fissionable materials and a comprehensive test ban are already addressed in other draft resolutions which my delegation not only votes for but sponsors.

Mr. JANDL (Austria): The Austrian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.33, "Nuclear-arms freeze". We did so because over the years we have been in agreement with the basic ideas and concepts of the so-called freeze and have supported the relevant draft resolutions.

However, with regard to recent developments on the international scene, in particular in the field of arms control and disarmament, we want now to emphasize that, in our understanding, the freeze should not prevent or impede the reduction of stockpiles of nuclear arms or the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Therefore, in our opinion, the freeze should be seen not as a concept contradicting such positive achievements as the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (INF Treaty) and other genuine disarmament agreements but rather as complementary to them.

Mr. MORRIS (Australia): I have just explained Australia's position on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.23, "Cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament and prevention of nuclear war", and I would now like to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.33, entitled "Nuclear-arms freeze". Australia has consistently supported the draft resolution on this subject since 1984. We continue to have sympathy for its objectives with respect to the qualitative development of nuclear weapons. However, we question the continuing relevance of the draft resolution in other respects at a time when not simply is a freeze being pursued, but in fact quantitative reductions in nuclear weapons are taking place.

Mr. ADANK (New Zealand): New Zealand voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.45/L.23, on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and the prevention of a nuclear war, and draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.33, concerning the nuclear-arms freeze. While New Zealand has supported both draft resolutions, it concurs in and would like to associate itself with the explanations of vote that have been made by the representative of Australia in respect of these two draft resolutions.

Mr. HU Xiaodi (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.25, entitled "Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons" because we are in favour of the main purpose of the draft resolution. This is known to all. Since the first day when nuclear weapons came into its possession, the Chinese Government has solemnly declared that China will at no time and in no circumstances be the first to use nuclear weapons. China has also undertaken to refrain from the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States or nuclear-weapon-free zones.

(Mr. Hu Xiaodi, China)

China has always maintained that, pending the achievement of the goal of a complete ban on and total destruction of nuclear weapons, all the nuclear States should undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons at any time and in any circumstances, and unconditionally promise to refrain from the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States or nuclear-weapon-free zones. On this basis, corresponding international agreements could be concluded. The Chinese delegation believes that some of the wording in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.25 and the draft convention annexed thereto could be further discussed and improved.

The Chinese delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.14, entitled "Comprehensive United Nations study on nuclear weapons". However, I should point out that the Chinese delegation did not participate in the vote on resolution 43/75 N, nor did Chinese Government experts participate in the research for the comprehensive study on nuclear weapons.

The policy and position of the Chinese Government on nuclear weapons and nuclear disarmament have been fully expounded in the relevant official documents of the Chinese Government and in the statements of Chinese leaders.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of and action on the draft resolutions in clusters 4 and 5, except for the draft resolutions which we decided at the beginning of our meeting to defer.

The Committee will proceed tomorrow to consider and take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 7, except for draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A and B; in cluster 6, in which draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56, as we have been informed, is the new merged text of L.9 and L.19; in cluster 8, the remaining draft resolution, A/C.1/45/L.51; and in cluster 9, draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1 and A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.